

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 752

UD 010 883

AUTHOR Irvine, La Verne F.; Brierley, Norman R.
TITLE Evaluation of Leadership and Crossover Teacher
Institutes Concerned with Problems of Desegregation.
INSTITUTION Auburn Univ., Ala.; University of South Alabama,
Mobile.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 70
NOTE 63p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.25
DESCRIPTORS Educational Administration, *Institutes (Training
Programs), Negro Culture, *Program Evaluation, *Race
Relations, Racial Attitudes, Racial Discrimination,
*School Integration, Teacher Education

IDENTIFIERS Alabama, *Auburn University

ABSTRACT

During 1969, groups of Southeast Alabama elementary and secondary school administrators, teachers, and supervisors participated in a series of eight training institutes concerning problems relating to school desegregation. Through the use of questionnaires, information was obtained relative to participants' motivation and expectations, participants' satisfactions and derived benefits from programs, and concerning participants' attitudes about race and desegregation. Responses toward the institutes were generally favorable and, in addition, reflected a positive approach in attempting to resolve problems regarding school desegregation. However, some negative views concerning both school desegregation and the institutes were evident. Recommendations are suggested for planning future institutes. (Author/JW)

ED0 45752

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AUBURN UNIVERSITY

**EVALUATION OF LEADERSHIP AND CROSSOVER TEACHER INSTITUTES
CONCERNED WITH PROBLEMS OF DESEGREGATION**

Report Submitted to United States Office of Education

By

La Verne F. Irvine and Norman R. Brierley

Department of Psychology

April 1970

UD010883

✓ **Southeast Alabama Title IV**

Project Directed By

Shelby Searcy

Supported By

**Auburn Center for Assistance with Problems
Arising from School Desegregation**

And

**University of South Alabama Center for
Intercultural Education**

CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	5
Problem and Approach	6
Results and Discussion	
Registrants and Questionnaires	9
Characteristics of Participants	11
Participant Motivation	13
Voluntary and Involuntary Attendance	15
Expectations Regarding Benefits	17
Participants' Questions	18
Indication that Participants Benefited	19
Indication that Questions Answered	23
Participant Satisfaction	25
Attitude Toward Desegregation	29
Change in Attitude	32
Change in Behavior	35
Unpleasant Incidents, Sincerity of Opposite Race, Thought of Resignation	38
Adequacy of Evaluation and Problems in Data Collection	40

Recommendations	
Institute Planning	43
Evaluation	45
Proposed Workshop	45
Summary	47
Appendices	51
Appendix A: Example Instruction Sheet	52
Appendix B: Biographical Data	53
Appendix C: Questions for Information Not Reported in Tables	54
Appendix D: Questions for Information Reported in Tables	55

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Date, Location, Number of Registrants, and Number of Useable Questionnaires for Each Institute	10
2. Characteristics of Participants Attending Each Institute in Terms of Race, Sex, Position and Teaching Experience	12
3. Percentage of Participants in Terms of Level of Motivation to Attend Institutes	14
4. Percentage of Participants Who Were Told to Attend or Who Volunteered to Attend Institute	16
5. Percentage of Participants Who Expected to Benefit from Institute	17
6. Percentage of Participants Who Said They Benefited	22
7. Percentage of Participants Who Indicated Institute Had Been of Value	26
8. Percentage of Participants and Their Degree of Satisfaction by Institute	28
9. Percentage of Participants with Different Attitudes Toward Desegregating Schools and School Activities.	31
10. Percentage of Participants Who Indicated Change of Attitude Associated with Influence of Institute(s)	34

LIST OF TABLES

(Continued)

11.	Percentage of Participants Who Indicated Behavior Change Associated With Influence of Institute(s)	38
12.	Percentage of Participants Who Reported Unpleasant Incidents, Indicated Opposite Race Sincere, Who Considered Resignation	40

ABSTRACT

During 1969, groups of Southeast Alabama elementary and secondary school administrators, teachers, and supervisors participated in a series of eight training institutes concerning problems relating to school desegregation. Through the use of questionnaires, information was obtained relative to participants' motivation and expectations, participants' satisfactions and derived benefits from programs, and concerning participants' attitudes about race and desegregation. Responses toward the institutes were generally favorable and, in addition, reflected a positive approach in attempting to resolve problems regarding school desegregation. Some negative views concerning both school desegregation and the institutes were evident. Recommendations were suggested for planning future institutes.

PROBLEM AND APPROACH

The Auburn University Center for Assistance with Problems Arising from School Desegregation, and the University of South Alabama Center for Inter-cultural Education, sponsored the Southeast Alabama Title IV Program for elementary and secondary school administrators, teachers, and supervisors. The program consisted of seven two-day institutes and one three-day institute held during 1969.

The institutes, held alternately on the campuses of both universities, were conducted to help school administrators and teachers identify and resolve problems associated with school desegregation. Sixteen county and city school systems participated in the program with each of the seven institutes beginning on Friday afternoon or evening, and ending Saturday at noon. The three-day institute, not considered in this report, was conducted in the summer of 1969 for crossover teachers. The institutes generally followed a format with a keynote speaker, discussion groups, and in some instances panels composed of visiting consultants. Topics were varied and included team teaching, individualized instruction, teaching the disadvantaged child, problems confronting the crossover teacher, and commitment to quality education.

The Director of the Institutes, and the University Centers,

requested assistance in assessing the influence of the institutes on the participants' attitudes and behaviors relative to issues concerning desegregation. Information was also requested regarding the participants' reactions to the institutes. The latter information was wanted to aid the Director in evaluating programs and to assist in planning succeeding institutes.

It was assumed that it would be difficult to obtain comparable control groups with which to compare the institute participants. It was also felt that initial assessments should be of a diagnostic and exploratory nature carried out to identify problems and the nature of attitudes relating to school desegregation.

Although it was anticipated that the same persons would continue as participants through several institutes, and thus permit a longitudinal study of individual changes in attitude and behavior over a period of several months, it soon became apparent that the institute membership fluctuated, thus making a longitudinal study impossible.

With the objective of obtaining information about participant reactions and changes in attitudes and behavior, several questionnaires were developed which included both fixed-alternative and open-end items. (See Appendices for specific items for this report.) The content of questions concerned participant motivation

and expectations, satisfactions, derived benefits from programs, and attitudes about race and desegregation. A 15-20 minute pretest questionnaire was distributed at the opening session of the institute(s) followed by a 15-20 minute posttest questionnaire distributed at the close. At the last institute a posttest questionnaire only was distributed.

This report concerns information describing the participants and expected benefits; information concerning satisfactions and derived benefits; information about the nature of attitudes concerning school desegregation, and information about attitudinal and behavioral changes following participation in the institute(s). The percentage of respondents falling within given response categories is presented along with an illustration of responses to open-end items to illustrate varied reactions. It is pointed out that the number of persons who responded appropriately differed from item to item and therefore the percentage of persons in the NA category (i.e., persons not accounted for in the main response categories) also differed from question to question.

Also included in the report is a brief discussion of problems relating to evaluation and recommendations with regard to the design of future institutes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Registrants and Questionnaires

Table 1 shows the number of persons registered for each of the institutes and the number of questionnaires that were used in the analysis of data. Also shown are the dates on which each institute was held and its location. The discrepancy between the number of registrants and the number of questionnaires for a specific institute reflects the approximate number of questionnaires lost for analysis. The number of registrants shown is approximate for in some instances the registration included both staff and participants as well as unofficial visitors. The staff, of course, did not complete questionnaires. Information was lost or otherwise discarded because participants did not complete both pretest and posttest questionnaires, omitted items, or gave more than one response to a given item.

Table 1

The Date, Location, Number of Registrants, and Number of Useable Questionnaires for Each Institute

Institute	I	II	III	IV	VI	VII	VIII
Date	March 28-29	April 25-26	May 9-10	May 16-17	October 24-25	November 21-22	December 12-13
Location	Auburn	Mobile	Auburn	Mobile	Auburn	Mobile	Mobile
Registrants	84	67	56	59	97	201	146
Questionnaires	79	59	35	51	86	171	104

Note. - Institute V, conducted in summer, not included.

Characteristics of Participants

Table 2 describes the percentage of participants attending each institute in terms of race, sex, and position. The information regarding teaching experience was collected only for Institutes VI - VIII.

It is apparent that the white participants outnumbered the blacks in all institutes with the exception of Institute VI. In the last two institutes there was a more equal distribution of white and black members.

The fact that male participants outnumbered females in the first four institutes reflects the fact that those programs were designed for school administrators and more males than females are in administrative positions. In the last three institutes, the number of females exceeded males, reflecting the fact that Institutes VI and VII were held primarily for teachers while Institute VIII was conducted for both teachers and administrators.

Table 2 also shows that teachers attending institutes VI, VII, and VIII varied in teaching experience ranging from the inexperienced to persons with over 25 years of experience.

TABLE 2

Characteristics of Participants Attending Each Institute in Terms of
Race, Sex, Position, and Teaching Experience

Percent

INSTITUTE	I (N=79)	II (N=59)	III (N=35)	IV (N=51)	VI (N=86)	VII (N=171)	VIII (N=104)
RACE							
Black	27	32	37	33	63	45	43
White	73	68	63	65	37	53	57
NA ^c				2		2	
SEX							
Male	82	78	80	65	44	38	40
Female	18	22	20	33	56	62	60
NA				2			
POSITION							
Principal	68	69	80	63		19	20
Supervisor	6	7	6	8		4	3
Superintendent	6	3		2			
Teacher						70	66
Other	19	20	14	26		7	9
NA							2
TEACHING EXPERIENCE						(N=119) ^a	(N=69) ^b
0					12	11	9
1 - 4					26	18	17
5-9					17	19	22
10-14					12	9	10
15-19					17	15	17
20-24					7	14	14
25 and over					9	13	10
NA							

a. Includes only teachers

b. Includes only teachers

c. Persons not accounted for or included in main response categories

Participant Motivation

To obtain some indication of the participants' motivation to attend the institutes, persons were asked at the beginning of Institutes I, II, and IV, "How do you feel about attending this institute?" Responses to the fixed-alternative response categories are summarized in Table 3. The results show that approximately 50% of the participants in the three institutes very much wanted to attend and therefore were presumably highly motivated to gain from the programs. Perhaps of more interest is the 50% or more of remaining persons who said that they had merely some desire to attend or were relatively indifferent about attending. If one assumes that the category, "I had some desire to attend," represents persons not highly motivated to gain from the programs, then it appears that a large number of individuals arrived at the institutes with a relatively indifferent attitude concerning the expected value of the experience.

TABLE 3
Percentage of Participants in Terms of Level of
Motivation to Attend Institutes

Desire to Attend	Institute		
	I (N=79)	II (N=59)	IV (N=51)
Very Much Wanted To	48	52	43
Some Desire To	42	41	47
Did Not Matter	9	7	6
Did Not Want To			2
^a NA	1		2

a. Not accounted for in main response categories

Voluntary and Involuntary Attendance

To obtain further information concerning the motivation of persons for attending the institutes, individuals attending Institutes II and IV were asked: "Were you told by a school official that you had to attend the (Mobile) Institute or are you attending voluntarily?" Also, the persons present at Institute VII (Mobile) indicated that their attendance was voluntary or involuntary in reply to a fixed-alternative question asking, "Why did you attend this institute?"

Table 4 indicates that the majority of participants had volunteered to attend. Unfortunately, there is some ambiguity associated with responses, due to the questionnaire items. In many instances, individuals who said that they had been requested to attend also commented that they wanted to attend. Therefore, being advised to attend possibly means in some instances that the participant was granted permission to attend. It is also possible that individuals who were told to attend convinced themselves, or otherwise rationalized, that they wanted to attend. To draw any conclusion about participant motivation from response to these items therefore seems unwarranted.

TABLE 4

Percentage of Participants Who Were Told to Attend or
Who Volunteered to Attend Institute

Reason	Institute		
	II (N=59)	IV (N=51)	VII (N=171)
Told	14	27	18
Volunteered	85	69	82
NAs	1	4	-

a. Not accounted for in main response categories

Expectations Regarding Benefits

Participants in Institutes I and II were asked at the opening session, "Do you expect to gain or benefit from this institute?" Despite the fact that a large number of persons indicated relatively little interest in attending (see Table 3), Table 5 reveals that all persons who did attend expected to benefit.

TABLE 5

Percentage of Participants Who
Expected to Benefit from Institute

Expect To Benefit	Institute	
	I (N=79)	II (N=59)
Yes	100	100
No	-	-
NA ^a	-	-

a. Not accounted for in main response categories.

Inspection of comments indicated that persons had varied expectations that included: learning about problems associated with desegregation and how to deal with them; learning how to

approach, without fear, a classroom containing students of both races; learning how to desegregate schools in a manner that offers little disruption to students, to school personnel, and to the community; clarifying leadership responsibilities in dealing with problems of desegregation; learning how to teach Negro children while maintaining educational standards; learning why people feel as they do about school desegregation.

From the variety of comments, one may conclude that persons came to the institutes with a wide range of goals and interests. Because of the diverse objectives and interests, there were probably persons whose learning needs were not met within a given institute.

Participants' Questions

To gather additional information about the concerns of members and what they hoped to learn from the institutes, the members of Institutes III and IV were asked: "Do you have specific questions that you would like to have answered at these institutes?"

Some of the items mentioned were: What are possible reactions of a small community if two of the eight cheerleaders are Negro? What are the problems of other school administrators? Why are some

persons assigned as crossover teachers while others volunteer?
How do students feel about issues discussed at these institutes?
When will workshops be held for parents? What does one do about
teachers who cross over under pressure but who are not doing a
good job? How does one obtain the cooperation of teachers in
working out problems? How does one get the teachers and the
parents of disadvantaged children involved in the school program?
How does one involve the parents of Negro children and make them
feel that you are sincere? How should one discipline students (of
each race) for fighting? What should be done about a white prin-
cipal who strikes a Negro female teacher? Is it "professional"
for a superintendent to discuss projects with principals (espe-
cially Negro principals) before projects are implemented? What
approach can be followed in overloaded classes to teach in a way
to be effective with each student?

The questions once again suggest that members had varied
needs and concerns which they hoped the institutes would help them
resolve.

Indication that Participants Benefited

At the conclusion of each of the first four institutes, the
participants were asked: "Do you feel that you personally gained

or benefited from this institute?" In addition, members of Institute VI responded at the close to the question: "Do you feel that you generally benefited by participation in this institute?"

Table 6 shows that the majority of persons felt they had benefited. Inspection of comments revealed benefits to include: increased awareness of others problems and the consequent recognition that one's own problems are not unique; recognition of the need for commitment to one's profession and the necessity for taking a positive stand on issues regarding integration; recognition that it was possible to carry on dialogue with an educator of the opposite race; recognition that it was unnecessary to hide one's own problems knowing that others had similar problems; recognition that the school should meet the needs of each individual; an increased conviction that one could establish rapport with a white teacher and help him and in turn encourage him to give help; a realization that the frank atmosphere revealed problems unknown to exist between whites and Negroes.

Several revealing comments were: "I think I personally opened up my feelings by bringing them out in an atmosphere of cooperation"; "It reinforced my belief that the Negro is being mistreated by the whole process"; "I gained a feeling of optimism, for the first time, that education will solve these problems";

"I feel that I have come to see that the big problem with which we must be concerned is that of quality education for all students and the 'spectre' of crossover and integration is really not the real issue."

In addition to help received in the attitudinal area, there was mention of benefits of a professional nature such as acquiring information about non-graded individualized instruction and the need to revise the curriculum.

In contrast to the number of positive comments those of a negative nature were relatively infrequent. One comment reflected disappointment and referred to the fact that many questions had not been discussed at the institute. No doubt other participants shared this feeling although how widespread was this view among members is unknown. Another person said he expected to deal with problems facing teachers in integrated schools but seemed disappointed because considerable time at a particular institute was devoted to Negro History.

TABLE 6

Percentage of Participants Who Said They Benefited

Benefited	Institutes					
	I (N=79)	II (N=59)	III (N=35)	IV (N=51)	V (N=36)	VI (N=86)
Yes	94	86	94	100	88	88
No	1	12	3		2	
Not Sure ^a						9
NA ^b	5	2	3			

a. "Not Sure" only on questionnaire for Institute VI.

b. Not accounted for in main response categories.

Indication that Questions were Answered

To determine if members felt that their questions were answered in the institute(s), and impressions about what persons thought constituted an answer, members were asked at Institutes III and IV: "Did you, here at this institute, get answers to some of the specific questions that you had hoped to have answered?"

Inspection of comments indicates that at least some persons felt their questions were answered. It is interesting to note that a person's statement of an answer often appears to be superficial although it is not clear whether the participant was aware of this fact. It is possible that, no matter how superficial a suggestion, some participants interpreted and accepted it as helpful. Moreover, the person may not have been deeply involved with the area or he may have had insufficient time to record the details stated to be of concern to him. It should also be noted that participants did not indicate the sources from which their answers were obtained.

Several questions, and what the participants interpreted to be answers (or suggestions), are illustrated from the comments of persons attending Institutes III and IV. Question: "How do you select textbooks?" Answer: "Select people of different cultures

to be on book committee." Question: "How do you work with student unrest?" Answer: "Through small group study." Question: "How do Negroes feel about crossing over?" Answer: "Hesitant about going into a new situation." Question: "What can be done about individual differences among students?" Answer: "Place emphasis on meeting individual needs." Question: "How can we better communicate between the two races?" Answer: "By understanding the individual as a human being." Question: "How to break the language barrier between people who hold different values?" Answer: "Try to read about, visit actual neighborhood, so that you can accept them." Question: "What problem can we expect when the cross-over student goes into a school of a predominately different race against his will?" Answer: "Frustration, hostility, different attitude, different motivation, different rewards, different expectations." Question: "How can lines of communication be established between students and teachers of different races?" Answer: "Through truthful exchanges of ideas, concepts, expectations." Question: "What do Negroes want to be called?" Answer: "Negroes." Question: "Do white administrators really want to be successful in educating students after integration?" Answer: "Yes."

It is of interest to note that although some questions concerned problems of a professional nature, many questions, and their answers, dealt directly with the areas of communication and human relationships.

Participant Satisfaction

To develop further impressions regarding reactions to the institute(s), participants were asked if they felt anything had been accomplished (Institute I), if they had received answers to their questions (Institutes III and IV), if they had learned anything to help them in their teaching (Institute VI), and if they felt the experience had been worthwhile (Institute VII). (Questionnaire items in Appendices).

Table 7 shows that the majority of persons in each of the institutes indicated that the experience had been of value as implied by their responses to the above questions.

TABLE 7
Percentage of Participants Who Indicated Institute Had Been of Value

Institute of Value	Institute			
	I ^a (N=79)	III ^b (N=35)	IV ^b (N=51)	VII ^d (N=171)
Yes	95	74	65	95
No	3	23	22	4
Not Sure				
NA ^f	3	3	14	2

Note. - Different questionnaire item for each institute as indicated.
(See Appendix for exact question.)

- a Anything accomplished?
- b Received answers?
- c Information helpful?
- d Experience worthwhile?
- e "Not sure" on questionnaire for Institute VI only
- f Not accounted for in main response categories

In addition, a measure of the participant's overall feeling of satisfaction was obtained at the close of Institutes I, II, III and IV and at the close of Institute VII. Participants were asked: "Were you generally satisfied or dissatisfied with this institute?"

Table 8 reveals that the majority of institute members were generally satisfied. However, the meaning of the variations between "Very Well Satisfied" and "Fairly Well Satisfied" is not clear from the members' responses. These differences in overall satisfaction may reflect variations in programs for some were more likely than others to arouse emotional feelings and provoke debate. Furthermore, it should be noted once again that the membership varied from institute to institute as did the location of meetings (held alternately in Auburn and Mobile).

Inspection of questionnaires revealed comments about a positive beginning, about an increase in understanding, and concerning the excellent participation. One person stated: "I feel I understand my role in the integration process more clearly." Another said: "I am well satisfied because it (the institute) indicates an awareness of the problems which exist in this period of transition. Too long we have failed to express the problems openly." In contrast to the positive comments there were relatively few negative ones and they referred to personal frustrations such as wasted time, and to the length of the institute sessions.

TABLE 8
Percentage of Participants and Their Degree of Satisfaction By Institute

Attitude	Institute				
	I (N=79)	II (N=59)	III (N=35)	IV (N=51)	VII (N=171)
Very Satisfied	48	31	63	51	56
Fairly Satisfied	39	59	29	37	29
Somewhat Dissatisfied	5	3	3	4	5
Very Dissatisfied	1			2	1
NA ^a	6	7	6	6	8

a. Not accounted for in main response categories.

Attitude Toward School Desegregation

To obtain insight about attitudes concerning school desegregation, investigators asked the participants to respond to the following item at the opening of Institute II: "People feel differently about desegregating the schools and desegregating school activities. Which one of the following statements best represents your view?" This item was followed by fixed-response categories that ranged from a statement that schools should not be desegregated to one which indicated that all school activities should be desegregated. (See Appendix D.) At the close of Institutes VII and VIII, the members were asked: "How do you feel at this time about desegregating the schools?" Response categories to this item ranged from one indicating that the respondent was much opposed to one indicating that the respondent was much in favor.

Table 9 indicates that the largest percentage of participants fall within favorable areas of response with 58% of Institute II members feeling that all school activities should be desegregated while 58% of Institute VII and 71% of Institute VIII members were in some degree favorable toward desegregating the schools.

The Institute VII members who were "Uncertain" concerning their attitude are of interest since this category represents approximately 30 participants who apparently were uncommitted, or perhaps otherwise unwilling to reveal their feelings.

Comments ranged from those indicating opposition to those indicating acceptance of desegregation. Typical comments were: "The people of this state do not favor it (school desegregation) and it is unconstitutional"; "I believe that desegregating the schools will eventually lead to widespread intermarriage between the races. This I oppose."; "As long as they (the schools) are separate, they will never be equal"; "If the conditions of black people are ever to be improved, they are going to have to get a decent education. They are not capable of educating themselves"; "I think it is educationally sound, but I dread the problems." No distinction was made in the analysis as to which of the above comments were made by Negroes.

TABLE 9

Percentage of Participants with Different Attitudes Toward
Desegregating Schools and School Activities

Response Category (Area or Activity to be Desegregated)	Institute II (N=59)	Response Category	Institute	
			VII (N=171)	VIII (N=104)
Not schools	14	Much opposed	6	5
Only Classroom		Somewhat Opposed	12	12
Only Classroom and Cafeteria	2	Uncertain	17	9
Only Classroom, Cafe- teria and Athletics	10	Somewhat in Favor	19	25
All School Activities <i>Activities</i>	58	Much in Favor	39	46
NA ^a	17	NA	8	4

Note. - While the question asked in Institute II concerned desegregating schools and school activities, the question used in Institutes VII and VIII asked only about desegregating schools.

a. Not accounted for in main response categories.

Change in Attitude

To obtain insight regarding possible attitude changes, the 44 members of Institute II (who had previously attended Institute I) were asked: "Do you feel that any of your opinions or feelings changed as a result of the institute at Auburn?" The members of Institute VI were asked at its close: "Have any of your attitudes been altered by the institute?" These persons had also indicated that they had attended prior institutes. Finally, members of Institute VIII were asked: "Do you feel that you have experienced any change in attitude as a result of attending any Title IV Institute?"

Table 10 shows that approximately 75% of the members of Institute VIII indicated change while a large percentage of persons in Institute II and VI remained unchanged. Unfortunately, the ambiguity of the question asked at Institute VIII (and which asked about "any" Title IV Institute) does not enable one to conclude that the participant associated his change in attitude with the 1969 program of institutes. Nevertheless, the comments made by the participants in Institute VIII were inspected to see what persons mentioned by way of attitude change.

The comments indicated that some institute members felt they

had broadened their understanding of the problems, increased their acceptance of members of the opposite race, and shifted their interest from racial issues to those involving education. Comments made by members of each race are presented to illustrate what the participant felt to be a change in attitude.

Comments made by Negro participants were: "I am able to work with the problems of both the white and Negro much better"; "I feel that my attitude toward some of the white teachers may have changed after associating with them and listening to their views toward desegregation"; "It made me more aware of the fact that I am prejudiced and has given me a desire to change"; "I'm more conscious of the 'whys' so far as the opposite race's attitude and their efforts to overcome their attitudes. Therefore I can be patient"; "This institute has helped me to accept each child, regardless of color."

Several comments made by white persons were: "I think I have learned to be more tolerant and appreciate the colored teachers' efforts..."; "I feel that I now understand some of the problems facing the other race"; "I am more willing to try to look for solutions to problems"; "I have learned of how the Negro feels about desegregation and crossover - I have become more tolerant of their feelings and attitudes"; "Change from concern about

integration to concern about instruction of students."

The comments suggest that the institutes possibly had some influence in altering attitudes of some persons although the breadth and permanence of these changes were no doubt varied. Moreover, the responses offer no insights as to the specific factors that brought about the change.

It should also be added that a response falling in the category of "No Change" is possibly not indicative of an unfavorable response. Some respondents may have felt generally favorable toward school desegregation and a response of "No Change" means that this attitude remains unaltered.

TABLE 10

Percentage of Participants Who Indicated Change of Attitude
Associated with Influence of Institute(s)

Attitude Change	Institute		
	II (N=44)	VI (N=86)	VIII (N=104)
Yes	43	31	72
No	50	64	19
NA ^a	7	5	9

a. Not accounted for in main response categories.

Change in Behavior

To gain impressions regarding the influence of the institute(s) on participant behavior, investigators asked persons who attended Institutes I and II, at the second institute, "Do you feel that any of your actions or behavior changed as a result of the institute at Auburn?" Also, members of Institute VIII were asked: "Do you feel that you have experienced any changes in behavior as a result of attending any Title IV Institute?"

Table 11 reveals that the participants in Institute II were about equally divided between those who said that they had changed and those who remained unchanged. The largest percentage of persons who indicated change were members of Institute VIII. Again, as with the earlier item dealing with attitude change, the question asked of Institute VII members referred to "any" Title IV Institute. The ambiguous nature of the question and the rather general response of participants does not offer enlightenment as to the specific institute or specific activity that may have lead to alterations in behavior. Again, it should be added that a response of "No Change" may not be indicative of continued action of a negative nature where racial matters are concerned. "No Change" may indicate that favorable behavior

existed at the outset and continues to be positive. To develop further impressions regarding the nature of changes, the comments of Institute VIII members were inspected.

If the respondents' comments can be accepted as valid indicators of change in behavior, it is apparent that some persons did alter their actions. Comments revealed references to working harder to resolve problems and speaking out about them; recognizing members of the opposite race as equals and accepting their word at face value; showing more appreciation for children and co-workers; being more tolerant of others.

Comments made by some of the Negro participants were:

"Because I understand the different problems that (we) have with black and white students I think I have begun to speak out and discuss race problems more freely without feeling that I am hurting someone's feelings"; "I, somewhat, take the words of the opposite race a little more at face value, rather than reading something else into their statements"; "(I) don't have the fear I once had."

Comments of white participants were: "I am trying to be more tolerant with the opposite race"; "I have been encouraged to continue to work harder"; "After seeing and hearing educated

blacks talk, I can and do recognize them as equal in business"; "I think that I can understand the problems that confront us better and therefore react to situations in a more intelligent manner"; "I have tried harder to show my appreciation for the children and teacher with whom I work"; "As greater hope is gained, one's plans naturally begin to materialize and one naturally begins to work harder toward that end"; "I hope I am more tolerant and a kinder person - I feel more capable."

The comments indicated that some persons did not distinguish between changes in attitude and changes in behavior. Moreover, as with the changes in attitude, there is no indication of the breadth of change nor information to speculate about its permanence. Furthermore, there was evidence to indicate that some members did not alter their actions as revealed by one person's statement: "The ideas gained are not possible to implement at this time." It is not clear what this individual had in mind with his reference to "ideas" for they could have concerned many things including interpersonal relationships, or new methods of instruction.

TABLE 11

Percentage of Participants Who Indicated Behavior Change
Associated with Influence of Institute(s)

Behavior Change	Institute	
	II (N=44)	VIII (N=104)
Yes	41	59
No	52	26
NA ^a	7	15

a. Not accounted for in main
response categories.

Unpleasant Incidents, Sincerity of Opposite Race, Thought of
Resignation

In order to gain further impressions concerning the nature of difficulties and the personal stress associated with desegregating the schools, members of Institute VI were asked the following question: "Have any unpleasant incidents happened at your school which you feel resulted from desegregating the schools?" Persons attending Institute VII were asked: "Do you believe the opposite race is sincere in its efforts to resolve the differences

relating to desegregation?" and "Have you considered resigning your position in the last year because of school desegregation?"

Table 12 shows that when one considers the total number of persons attending each of these institutes, the percentage of persons falling in the "Yes" category is relatively high. Approximately 24 persons acknowledged unpleasant incidents and approximately 68 persons doubted the sincerity of the opposite race. Furthermore, the 34 members of Institute VII who fell within the NA category concerning their belief about the sincerity of the opposite race means that a large number of persons did not respond to this question. Reasons for not responding are unknown although one might speculate concerning a reluctance to reveal feelings or uncertainty about them. The fixed-alternative response categories for this item made no provision for the person "Unsure" of his view.

TABLE 12

Percentage of Participants Who Reported Unpleasant Incidents, Indicated Opposite Race Sincere, Who Considered Resignation

Question	Institute VI (N=86)			Institute VII (N=171)		
	Yes	No	NA ^d	Yes	No	NA
Unpleasant Incidents at Your School? ^a	28	60	13			
Believe Opposite Race Sincere? ^b				39	40	20
Considered Resignation? ^c				9	88	4

a. Asked at Institute VI only.

b. Asked at Institute VII only.

c. Asked at Institute VII only.

d. Not accounted for in main response category.

Adequacy of Evaluation and Problems in Data Collection

The Director of the Institutes and the University Centers had hoped that the evaluation would serve two functions: provide immediate information about participant reactions to each of the institute programs; provide information concerning the influence of the institutes on the attitudes and behaviors of the participants.

In the judgment of the evaluator, the information proved of

value for immediate "on the spot" assessment and helpful in planning succeeding institute programs. The evaluation provided only limited information concerning attitudinal and behavioral changes and regarding the nature of the institutes' contributions to these changes. Ideally, evaluation instruments would have measured behavioral changes directly associated with program objectives. Also, a follow-up assessment would have been conducted to note changes in the participants' attitudes and behavior within schools following the termination of the institutes. The evaluation has, however, provided impressions helpful for planning a series of problem-solving workshops, and has in addition provided information underlying the recommendations offered in the next section of the report.

The rapport with institute members relative to the task of collecting data generally appeared to be excellent. There were however problems. In some instances, persons conversed with others about questionnaire items, or items were omitted or incorrectly completed, or questionnaires were not returned. In some cases written responses were not legible. In addition, late arrivals at each of the institutes made it impossible to collect information from them. These conditions resulted in a considerable

amount of information being lost. Other problems occurred because a few persons attended the institutes as unregistered visitors and, in all probability, completed and turned in questionnaires. In addition, questionnaires were completed in crowded group settings. The latter problem raises question about the honesty of the participant concerning his responses and comments. Although it was stressed that individuals should be frank, and were assured that anonymity would be respected, it is not known to what degree a peer looking over an individual's shoulder may have influenced the response.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Institute Planning

The information collected in the present evaluation reveals that persons came to the institutes with a variety of expectations. Some persons wanted assistance with problems relating to attitudes and interpersonal relationships while others were seeking new information and the opportunity to learn new professional skills. One might speculate that institute programs will have potentially greater impact on participants if more attention is given to their selection relative to program and objectives. This suggestion possibly requires additional planning by school administrators in deciding what persons should attend specific institutes. In addition, institute directors can perhaps make programs more effective by close screening of participants relative to program objectives and the anticipated behavioral outcomes on the part of participants.

A further problem, in addition to the selection of participants, is that of membership stability. Lack of member stability from institute to institute poses problems for both programming and evaluation. One might speculate that the same

participants involved over a series of institutes are going to derive greater benefits and personal satisfactions than are participants who are sporadic in attendance and who cause the membership to vary from institute to institute.

Moreover, in observing some of the small group sessions, the evaluator was impressed with the fact that some issues and questions kept recurring. At the same time, one sensed an impatience on the part of persons who had probably already passed over similar ground. The point is that some participants had, in earlier institutes, dealt with certain issues and were ready to move on. In contrast, new participants had yet to work through the same problems. These considerations raise questions regarding the disruptive effect of an unstable membership over a series of institutes. On the other hand, one could speculate about possible beneficial outcomes associated with mixing persons who are at different levels of readiness to face issues. It is possible that some persons who were reluctant to voice views may have been encouraged by observing and listening to peers who earlier resolved such inhibitions. However, the specific recommendation offered here is to develop selection procedures that ensure a stable membership for a given series of institutes.

Evaluation

Although the assessments made at each institute provided information helpful for institute programing, the information was scant in providing understanding with regard to the adjustments of persons to school desegregation. Adjustment involves changes in attitudes and behavior. Intensive interview studies appear needed to provide information about the underlying problems and the dynamics of change. In addition, there appears to be a need for diagnostic studies to identify the need for specific institute programs and to further identify the specific participants who should be involved with each.

Proposed Workshop

To assist school personnel in getting further involved in identifying and resolving their own problems, the Director of the present institutes and the evaluator collaborated in the development of a proposal for a series of problem-solving workshops. The workshops will focus on problem areas that indirectly, or directly, involve considerations relating to race and the problems of school desegregation. They will be conducted as problem-solving sessions with the participants

expected to identify and define the problems, develop solutions, and plan and implement appropriate changes. The workshop format will thus provide the participants with a problem-solving model that should serve as a guide for similar programs within the participants' school. The workshops will involve teams composed of key persons from each school - a principal and two of his teachers. Several such teams will constitute the membership of each of the problem-solving work groups. Evaluation will concern immediate outcomes (in terms of participant satisfaction, increased knowledge of problem-solving, increased awareness of problems and solutions) as well as longer range outcomes (in terms of participants' efforts and success in establishing inservice problem-solving within the participants' school).

SUMMARY

A large group of Southeast Alabama elementary and secondary school administrators, teachers, and supervisors participated in eight short institutes during 1969 to assist in dealing with problems and issues relating to school desegregation. Some of the topics explored (with the aid of keynote speakers, discussion groups, and panels) were team teaching, individualized instruction, teaching the disadvantaged child, problems confronting the crossover teacher, and commitment to quality education. The institutes were sponsored by The Auburn Center for Assistance with Problems Arising from School Desegregation and the University of South Alabama Center for Inter-cultural Education. Meetings were held alternately at Auburn University and the University of South Alabama on Friday afternoon (or evening) and Saturday morning.

An evaluation was conducted by questionnaire to obtain participants' reactions to the institutes and information concerning changes in attitudes and behavior. Pretest and posttest questionnaires were distributed at each institute and included both fixed-alternative and open-end questions. Some questions

remained the same in content over all institutes while other items varied from institute to institute. A general analysis of questionnaire data was completed for all but the summer institute conducted for crossover teachers. The results reported concern participant motivation and expectations, participant satisfactions, derived benefits from programs, and information concerning attitudes about race and desegregation. Some of the findings (based upon information collected at different institutes) were:

1. Approximately 50% of those responding indicated a strong interest in attending the institute(s) with the remainder expressing somewhat less interest (Table 3).
2. A majority of those attending did so voluntarily and expressed a high level of expectation that they would benefit from the institute. (Tables 4 and 5.)
3. Eighty six to 100 % of the participants said, following the meetings, that they had benefited. (Table 6.)
4. Although respondents generally felt that the institutes had been of value they varied somewhat on their overall level of satisfaction. (Tables 7 and 8.)
5. Attitudes toward school desegregation were varied with responses ranging from those opposed to desegregating schools to those in favor of desegregating all school

activities. (Table 9.)

6. While limited information was obtained concerning changes in attitudes and behavior, a number of participants felt that their attitudes and behavior had been influenced by the institutes. (Tables 10 and 11.)
7. There was some report of unpleasant incidents within the schools although 88% of those who responded indicated that they had not considered resigning because of school desegregation. The respondents were about equally divided in their feelings about the sincerity of the opposite race in dealing with issues relating to desegregation. (Table 12.)

The evaluation proved helpful for immediate assessment of participants' reactions regarding the institutes and programs and were in turn helpful in planning for succeeding programs. Limited information was obtained, however, regarding attitudinal and behavioral change. Data collection was hampered by situational factors such as crowding, and tardiness, and difficulties were encountered in the analysis because of incomplete questionnaires or incorrectly completed and omitted items.

Recommendations were suggested for designing future institutes with more attention given to the selection of participants

and the matching of participant needs and interests with program topics and objectives. It was also suggested that procedures be established to ensure stability of membership over a series of institutes where programs are intended for a continuing membership. A brief description was also given of a proposed problem-solving workshop for principal and teacher teams from specific schools.

APPENDICES

A - D

APPENDIX A
Example Instruction Sheet

INSTRUCTIONS

The success of this and future institutes depends to a large degree on successful evaluation. This evaluation, in turn, can only be made by those who participate in the Institute.

In this questionnaire, please answer all questions as completely as possible. Give only one response unless more than one is indicated.

Thank you for your assistance.

L. F. Irvine

Auburn University

APPENDIX B
Biographical Data
(Table 2 in Text)

Code Number _____

1. Race:

(1) Black _____

(2) White _____

2. Sex

(1) Male _____

(2) Female _____

3. Position: (Check one only.)

(1) Superintendent _____

(2) Principal _____

(3) Supervisor _____

(4) Teacher _____

(5) Other _____

Please specify: _____

4. If teacher, how many years experience?

(1) 0 _____

(2) 1 - 4 _____

(3) 5 - 9 _____

(4) 10 - 14 _____

(5) 15 - 19 _____

(6) 20 - 24 _____

(7) 25 & over _____

APPENDIX C

Questions For Information Not Reported in Tables

Institute III

- 1. Do you have specific questions you would like to have answered at these institutes?**
- 2. Did you, here at this institute, get answers to some of the specific questions that you had hoped to have answered?**

Institute IV

- 1. Do you have specific questions you would like to have answered at these institutes?**
- 2. Did you, here at this institute, get answers to some of the specific questions that you had hoped to have answered?**

APPENDIX D

Questions For Information Reported in Tables

Table 3

1. People feel differently about institutes. How do you feel about attending this institute? (Pretest: Institutes I, II, and IV.)
 - (1) I very much wanted to attend.
 - (2) I had some desire to attend.
 - (3) It really did not matter whether I did, or did not, attend.
 - (4) I did not want to attend.

Table 4

1. Were you told by a school official that you had to attend the Mobile institute or are you attending voluntarily? (Pretest: Institutes II and IV.)
 - (1) Told to attend
 - (2) Attending voluntarily
2. Why did you attend this institute? (Pretest: Institute VII)
 - (1) I volunteered to attend.
 - (2) I was told to attend.

APPENDIX D

(Continued)

Table 5

1. Do you expect to gain or benefit from this institute?
(Pretest: Institutes I and II.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
2. If yes, indicate how, or the ways in which you hope to gain or benefit from the institute. (Please list in their order of importance to you.)

Table 6

1. Do you feel that you personally gained or benefited from this institute? (Posttest: Institutes I, II, III, and IV.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
2. If yes, briefly indicate in what way(s) you gained or benefited. (Please list the ways you benefited in their order of importance to you.)
3. Do you feel that you generally benefited by participation in the institute? (Posttest: Institute VI.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
4. Explain why you feel as you do.

APPENDIX D

(Continued)

Table 7

1. Do you feel that anything was accomplished by this institute?
(Posttest: Institute I)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
2. If yes, briefly indicate what you feel was accomplished.
(Please list accomplishments in order of their importance to you.)
3. Did you, here at this institute, get answers to some of the specific questions that you had hoped to have answered?
(Posttest: Institutes III and IV.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
4. If yes, please indicate the questions for which you have received an answer and give a brief statement concerning the nature of the answers.
5. Have you learned any specific things at the institute that you feel will help you in your teaching? (Posttest: Institute VI.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) Not Sure
 - (3) No

APPENDIX D

(Continued)

6. If yes, please indicate some of the things that you have learned which you feel will be helpful.
7. Do you feel this institute has been a worthwhile experience for you? (Posttest: Institute VII.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
8. Please explain.

Table 8

1. Were you generally satisfied or dissatisfied with this institute? (Posttest: Institutes I, II, III, IV, and VII.)
 - (1) Very well satisfied
 - (2) Fairly well satisfied
 - (3) Somewhat dissatisfied
 - (4) Very much dissatisfied
2. Briefly indicate why you feel as you do.

APPENDIX D

(Continued)

Table 9

1. People feel differently about desegregating the schools and desegregating the school activities. Which one of the following statements best represents your view? (Pretest: Insitute II)
 - (1) Schools should not be desegregated.
 - (2) Only the classroom should be desegregated.
 - (3) Only the classroom and school cafeteria should be desegregated.
 - (4) Only the classroom, the shool cafeteria and school athletics should be desegregated.
 - (5) All school activities including clubs, extra-curricular, and social activities should be desegregated.
2. Please explain briefly why you feel as you do.
3. How do you feel, at this time, about desegregating the schools?
(Posttest: Institutes VII and VIII.)
 - (1) I am very much opposed.
 - (2) I am somewhat opposed.
 - (3) I am uncertain as to how I feel.
 - (4) I am somewhat in favor.
 - (5) I am very much in favor.
4. Please explain.

APPENDIX D

(Continued)

Table 10

1. Do you feel that any of your opinions or feelings changed as a result of the institute at Auburn? (Pretest: Institute II.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
2. If yes, please describe in what way your opinions and feelings changed.
3. Have any of your attitudes been altered by the institute? (Posttest: Institute VI.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
4. If yes, what attitudes? Be specific.
5. Do you feel that you have experienced any changes in attitude as a result of attending any Title IV institute? (Posttest: Institute VIII.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
6. Please explain.

APPENDIX D
(Continued)

Table 11

1. Do you feel that any of your actions or behavior changed as a result of the institute at Auburn? (Pretest: Institute II.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
2. If yes, please describe in what way your actions or behavior changed.
3. Do you feel that you have experienced any changes in behavior as a result of attending any Title IV institute? (Posttest: Institute VIII)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
4. Please explain.

Table 12

1. Have any unpleasant incidents happened at your school which you feel resulted from desegregating the schools? (Pretest: Institute VI)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
2. If yes, briefly describe the incident(s).

APPENDIX D

(Continued)

3. Do you believe the opposite race is sincere in its efforts to resolve the differences relating to desegregation? (Pretest: Institute VII.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
4. Please explain why you feel as you do.
5. Have you considered resigning your position in the last year because of school desegregation? (Posttest: Institute VII.)
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No
6. If yes, please explain why.